

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application in view of this response is respectfully requested. Claims 1-11 are currently in this case.

One aspect of the present invention is directed to a system and method for creating colorable line drawings. The system includes a computer, a video display, a printer for printing a line drawing on a sheet, means to feed into the computer the digital images to be converted, software for conversion of said images, and further means of transferring the digital image printed by the printer onto a substrate. The substrate may include paper, plastic, glass, wood, metal, T-shirts, or transparencies.

Rejection under 35 USC § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 5-9 of the current application as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,727,906 (Lockeridge).

Lockeridge discloses a computer, a video terminal, a printer, and a means to feed into the computer a digital image of the picture or design to be converted. The Examiner alleges that that Lockeridge also discloses “further means for transferring the digital image to a substrate. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion.

Claim 1 requires a printer *and* a means for transferring a digital image or a printed sheet to a substrate. Lockeridge does not show any printing device in its system figure (*see, Fig. 10*, and only mentions a “color output device” on which an image can be output. *See, Lockeridge, col. 9 at line 9-10.* Lockeridge does not show or disclose another output printer or a separate means for transferring a digital image to a substrate such as a T-shirt.

Thus, Lockeridge fails to teach or suggest one of the elements of claim 1, a means for transferring a digital image to a substrate. Accordingly, Lockeridge cannot anticipate claim 1, and allowance of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 3, and 5-8 depend on claim 1 and thus incorporate its every limitation. Since Lockeridge does not anticipate claim 1, Lockeridge does not anticipate claims 2, 3, and 5-8. Accordingly, allowance of claims 2, 3 and 5-8 is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 is an independent method claim, and includes the steps of printing a line drawing and also coloring the printed line drawing after the step of printing either before or after the printed line drawing is transferred to a substrate material. The Examiner has

rejected claim 9 in view of Lockeridge. As previously mentioned, Lockeridge appears to disclose outputting an image to a “color output device.” *See, Lockeridge, col. 9 at line 9-10.* Lockeridge does not teach or suggest the additional step of coloring the printed line drawing after the step of printing either before or after the printed line drawing is transferred to a substrate material, as required by claim 9.

Thus, Lockeridge fails to teach or suggest one of the steps of claim 9, and cannot anticipate claim 1. Accordingly, allowance of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claim 4 of the current application as obvious under Lockeridge. Claim 4 depends indirectly from claim 1, incorporating each limitation of claim 1. As previously described, Lockeridge fails to teach or suggest claim 1, and therefore also fails to teach or suggest claim 4. Accordingly, allowance of claim 4 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner further rejected claims 10 and 11 as obvious in view of a combination of Lockeridge and the U.S. Patent 6,325,560 (Hirabayashi). Applicant respectfully traverses this ground for rejection.

Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 9. Lockeridge has been described and does not disclose the inventions specified in claims 9-11. Hirabayashi discloses a wide format printer and does not disclose the inventions specified in claims 9-11. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in Hirabayashi to combine a wide format printer with a system such as Lockeridge to work with line drawings of any sort. Accordingly, the combination of Lockeridge and Hirabayashi also does not teach or suggest the inventions specified in claims 9-11. For at least these reasons, allowance of claims 10-11 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

It is believed that all objections set forth in the previous Office Action have been fully met, and favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at

this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (732-815-0404) to discuss any additional objections.

Respectfully submitted,

NORTON & DIEHL LLC
77 Brant Avenue
Clark, NJ 07066

Dated: October 12, 2005

By: Glen M. Diehl

GLEN M. DIEHL
Reg. No. 33,377
(732) 815-0404 (Telephone)
(732) 815-1330 (Facsimile)